

1 MR. LA CAMERA: No. Again, as Bruce pointed out,
2 you have to remember that's complemented by the vigorous
3 syndicated marketplace and what's occurring in local
4 children's production around the country.

5 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: Accepting, accepting that, --

6 MR. LA CAMERA: And local children's production --

7 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: -- accepting that, are you saying
8 that these numbers will not continue to go up because we fit
9 the level of maximum encouragement?

10 MR. LA CAMERA: No. And, in fact, again, to, to, to
11 repeat what Bruce had to say, I think the syndicated
12 marketplace is telling us that, that continued progress is
13 going to be made from what -- from the, the product that's
14 becoming available virtually every day in that arena.

15 MS. ELLERBEE: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

16 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: Thanks.

17 MS. ELLERBEE: Mr. Johansen has asked to add one,
18 one statement at the end if that's all right with you?

19 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: That seems fair.

20 MR. JOHANSEN: -- read this because I know we're
21 short of time. In reaction to Peggy's suggestion, you had
22 asked for comments on the payment of fees. I would echo what
23 Paul had said, that broadcasters would not want to give up
24 that right. In fact, there are really only two areas now, a
25 local broad -- where a local broadcaster has an opportunity to

1 peruse programming. That's news and children's programming.
2 And you see an enormous number of local children's programs
3 being developed in the local scene. And to take away that
4 obligation and that opportunity I think would be distressing
5 for broadcasters.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. ELLERBEE: I've, I've been informed that we will
8 take an hour for lunch instead of an hour and a half.

9 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: Thanks everyone. It's a terrific
10 panel. Thank you very much.

11 (End of Panel 2.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PANEL 3

MS. ELLERBEE: -- the subject is the Economics of Providing Educational and Informational Programming for Children. And just to sort of put this one in perspective, I think we can pretty much all agree that if it weren't for this issue, Panels 1 and 2 probably would not have been necessary.

Our first panel member to testify this afternoon, or, or to give a presentation is Karen Jaffe who is the Executive Director of KIDSNET which is a non-profit computerized clearinghouse for children's audio, video, radio and television.

MS. JAFFE: Thank you, Linda. Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I am pleased to once again participate in an FCC en banc proceeding on the subject of children and television. Over 11 years ago I sat in this same room at the last children's en banc hearing to explore the role of the federal government in the future of children's television. I think it's fair to say we've come full circle in many areas.

A decade ago, I founded KIDSNET, a non-profit computerized clearinghouse on children's audio, video, radio and television. Our mission is to increase the quality and quantity of children's programs and by generating audiences for these programs we can increase the demand for more product of this caliber. KIDSNET already puts children's programming

1 on the information superhighway. We are not just planning to
2 do this in the future. It is something we have already put
3 into practice, using the information infrastructure to help
4 educators and parents identify quality programs for children.

5 Today's discussion focuses on a singular point in my
6 view, that the industry has argued for years that in lieu of a
7 spectrum fee, they offer programming in the public interest.
8 Thus, the fact that the economics of children's television are
9 different than the financing of adult programming is in a real
10 sense irrelevant. This public interest obligation is the
11 proper basis for exceptional rules for children's television.

12 Up to now the Commission has been vague about the
13 broadcaster's responsibility to children. In my view, the FCC
14 is not being fair to the broadcaster nor representing the
15 interest of the public.

16 Broadcasters cannot object to rendering such public
17 service. They cannot say to Congress that there should be no
18 spectrum usage fee because of their public service
19 obligations, and then argue that there can be no reasonable
20 accountability in this unique and most vital area.

21 My suggestions are that the FCC can set out
22 procedures which, if followed in good faith by the
23 broadcaster, have been shown to contribute to quality. These
24 procedures can be appropriately taken into account in the
25 renewal process.

1 Among the broadcasters -- the steps that
2 broadcasters could take which would warrant a merit or credit
3 at renewal would be the following tools and some of them have
4 been suggested in the two previous panels.

5 Number one, ascertainment. Number two, a children's
6 advisory board, which could be created as a result of the
7 ascertainment procedure. Three, educational consultants who
8 are not window dressing but have a viable role in the
9 development of programs. Four, ancillary materials such as
10 study guide, scripts, bibliographies available to educators.
11 Five, specials designed as a continuing effort and with
12 appropriate promotion and publicity. Family programming, not
13 in lieu of the core but in addition to it. And that is
14 specifically accompanied by unique outreach, materials and
15 promotion that directly targets children. Seven, the most
16 important is continuity. Children's programs that aren't on a
17 regular schedule lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of no
18 audience. In addition, programs that are not promoted or
19 advertised will also not capture an audience. This, in my
20 view, has been the pattern for much of children's television.
21 Eight, as we all prepare for the opportunities of the
22 electronic superhighway, it's important to consider what role
23 children's programming will play so that the super can reflect
24 quality, not just size. While the Commission is considering
25 rules to increase the public service for children's television

1 programs, you should be looking at creative incentives for the
2 key of the industry to become a player in providing reasonable
3 access to its programs, through new delivery mechanisms.

4 Without restricting commerce, I believe that there
5 are several options for copyright allowances that could be
6 negotiated among the producers and distributors of these
7 programs which would benefit the public sector. This would
8 involve encouraging creative, financial arrangements and
9 copyright clearances when programs are first developed.

10 Speaking of creative financing and in response to
11 Commissioner Ness' query, I feel strongly that the FCC should
12 investigate options within the federal tax structure that
13 could provide financial incentives for commercial companies to
14 joint venture with public broadcasters, to create children's
15 programming. I've elaborated on this notion in my full
16 statement with many examples of these public private
17 partnerships on the national as well as the local level. When
18 I came here over a decade ago, I suggested that the Commission
19 create a temporary commission on children's television, to
20 provide a forum for dialogue on a non-adversarial -- in a non-
21 adversarial atmosphere. I'm back again with the same thought.
22 This group could be charged with identifying the definition of
23 what is educational and information -- informational
24 programming for children, what are the specific age groups
25 that should be targeted and what specific objectives and

1 suggested ways that a broadcaster might meet these objectives
2 with their programming?

3 You've heard from many experts this morning who said
4 that we should have a definition and I certainly think this is
5 possible. I have more suggestions in my testimony.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. ELLERBEE: Thank you very much. Next, we'll
8 hear from Shari Lewis, producer and entertainer on Lambchop's
9 Play-Along.

10 MS. LEWIS: I was amused when I was invited here
11 today to speak on the economics of quality children's
12 programming and not on the programming itself. I will try to
13 stick to the subject but you cannot completely disassociate
14 quality programming from the economics of quality programming
15 because investing and making money is the driving force behind
16 everything in our culture that is associated with the
17 commercial marketplace.

18 I know from personal painful experience that there
19 are few theatrical fields that are more starved for financing
20 than that of quality children's entertainment.

21 I grew up in this arena and it has always been that
22 programs featuring explosions, crashes, chases, physical and
23 verbal aggression which are the genuinely the main forms of
24 expression in children's entertainment, get far bigger bucks
25 from both network and cable broadcasters than do more gentle,

1 intelligent and socially positive materials. It could be an
2 invaluable contribution were the FCC, as Karen says, to find
3 ways to financially encourage the invention of high energy
4 shows of, of finer sort.

5 Now, when PBS bought my Lamb Chop's Play-Along, they
6 paid all that they could afford which was very little. The
7 dollars were augmented by the corporation for Public
8 Broadcasting. I am genuinely grateful for both; however, I
9 still had a huge budget shortfall. No one on my program,
10 neither production staff, writers, performing talent, was
11 making but a very small percentage of their normal
12 compensation. And we still lacked approximately 50 percent of
13 our stringent budget.

14 For the rest of my production dollars, I went to and
15 acquired a partner and executive producer to whom I had to
16 give 50 percent of everything except my first born. His name
17 is Jon Slan, excellent partner, of Paragon Entertainment, a
18 Canadian company. Now, why Canadian? Because the Canadian
19 government has developed various supportive devices for the
20 kind of programming that they wish to have available for the
21 Canadian viewing public and the manner in which they do so
22 presents a possible pattern for the stimulation of quality
23 children's shows in America as well.

24 Canadian companies can get tax benefits and
25 government funding.

1 The tax benefits result in the producer being able
2 to defer taxes and so, have extra money in pocket. The net
3 effect is the value of the producer's investment is 20 to 30
4 percent better.

5 The public funding happens in a number of arenas.
6 Telefilm, a national fund, has over \$100 million a year to
7 distribute. Each of the provinces also have created ways to
8 bring in film production. The Ontario Film Investment Program
9 has an annual 14 million to distribute. They rebate to
10 production companies of certified Ontario programs 15 to 20
11 percent of the production budget. They also have a cable fund
12 that has 30 million available. All of these financial aids
13 have one thing in common: they encourage the production of
14 programming that Canada feels is important to Canada. These
15 techniques, be they tax benefits or government funding, have
16 been phenomenally successful in stimulating the Canadian
17 entertainment industry.

18 Well, see, your part, one of the greatest services
19 that the FCC could possibly perform would be to influence our
20 government to provide financial incentives to help producers
21 and broadcasters accomplish the stated intentions of both the
22 Children's Television Act, and of the America 2000 goals.

23 You know, after all, we give tax credit to encourage
24 the sale of stations to minority ownership because the
25 government wants to encourage minority broadcasters. If the

1 government also genuinely wants to encourage enriching
2 educational information programming for kids, why shouldn't
3 that be incentivized, as well?

4 I'd like to see the FCC take an active part in
5 looking for ways to make it more attractive for both producers
6 and broadcasters to create shows that will be constructive
7 for, rather than destructive of our children.

8 And, you know, a number of financial formats exist.
9 Among them, the investment tax credit. From the '60s to the
10 '80s all you heard about was the ITC which was a hugely
11 important stimulus for the production of motion pictures and
12 individual works, both manufacturing and of theatrical and
13 publishing.

14 This rule said that up to 10 percent of the total
15 cost of a production may be taken as a tax credit at the point
16 of first exhibition.

17 And because the ITC was a tax provision, the -- it
18 was revealed -- repealed -- it was also revealed -- the
19 legislative language for it still exists and the provision
20 could easily be modified and reinstated.

21 Then there's a gross revenue exclusion in which --

22 MS. ELLERBEE: Excuse me. This is not your fault
23 because you weren't here this morning but when the red light
24 goes on the idea is you finish the sentence --

25 MS. LEWIS: Oh.

1 MS. ELLERBEE: -- and your time is up.
2 MS. LEWIS: All right. May Lamb Chop just say a
3 word?
4 MS. ELLERBEE: Of course.
5 MS. LEWIS: Come on, Lamb Chop.
6 MS. ELLERBEE: Why didn't you say so?
7 LAMB CHOP: She did say so. Uhm, Uhm, uhm, where am
8 I?
9 MS. LEWIS: Well, you're at the FCC.
10 LAMB CHOP: Oh, yeah, well, how come you're nervous?
11 MS. LEWIS: I'm not nervous.
12 LAMB CHOP: Yes, you're nervous.
13 MS. LEWIS: How can you tell I'm nervous?
14 LAMB CHOP: Your palm is sweaty.
15 MS. LEWIS: My palm is not sweaty.
16 LAMB CHOP: No, the other hand.
17 MS. LEWIS: Oh, oh. Lamb Chop, what would you like
18 to say?
19 LAMB CHOP: I would like to applaud the FCC for
20 caring about children's television and making it better.
21 MS. LEWIS: I would like to applaud the FCC, too.
22 LAMB CHOP: No, no, no. No, let me do the
23 applauding.
24 MS. LEWIS: Why?
25 LAMB CHOP: Because every time you clap your hands

1 together, I black out.

2 MS. LEWIS: Oh, okay. Okay. Well, I would just
3 like to say thank you for all of your good work. I'm very
4 happy to be here. I've never been under a red light before.
5 It's pretty exciting. Say goodbye, Lamb Chop.

6 LAMB CHOP: Goodbye, Lamb Chop.

7 MS. LEWIS: Good bye.

8 MS. ELLERBEE: I assure you that in this instance
9 the red light is our loss. Our next panelist is Johnathan
10 Rodgers, President of CBS Television Stations Division.

11 MR. RODGERS: I knew you would do this to me. Do I,
12 I have to follow the puppet?

13 MS. LEWIS: Actually, I feel as though I've been
14 fleeced but that's --

15 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Johnathan, Johnathan won't
16 feel bad. You know, Johnathan and I have been friends for a
17 long time and we'll have many more eves and Sunday afternoons
18 to spend together.

19 MR. RODGERS: Unfortunately, yes. My name is
20 Johnathan Rodgers, and I am President of the CBS Television
21 Stations Division.

22 My own perspective on these issues comes as one who
23 has long been involved in buying, producing and scheduling
24 programming for their CBS owned television stations.

25 In the Children's Television Act, Congress required

1 each commercial television station to present some educational
2 and informational programming for children. I believe that
3 our industry for the most part has taken that obligation very
4 seriously.

5 At CBS, for example, we have brought the critically-
6 acclaimed children's science program, Beakman's World , to
7 network television, thereby benefiting not only our station
8 but our affiliates as well. On the local level, each of the
9 CBS owned television stations presents at least one weekly
10 standard length programming which meets the requirements of
11 the Act. These programs, some locally produced, range from
12 KCBS's award winning Kid Quiz to WBBM's award winning
13 Different Drummers. And the program production and
14 syndication market -- responding to the ACT with more and more
15 pride.

16 Some of our stations, for examples, air such award
17 winning syndicated programs as Nick News and Adventures in
18 Wonderland.

19 In seeking to meet the objectives of the Children's
20 Television Act in a meaningful way, it is our challenge to
21 present programming which is not only educational, but
22 sufficiently entertaining so that children will watch it.
23 That is not an easy task in today's multichannel universe, in
24 which we are witnessing an explosion in the viewing choices
25 available to adults and to children.

1 In 1955, when CBS began offering its pioneering
2 children's series, Captain Kangaroo, the average household had
3 access to only three channels. Substantial audiences came to
4 those channels because there was nowhere else to go.

5 Our current pioneering network series, Beakman's
6 World, is being offered in an era when the average household
7 has access to 39 broadcast and cable channels, as well as home
8 video. To state the obvious, the competition for audiences,
9 child and adult, has become increasingly intense, in an
10 environment of channel abundance that the FCC, the Congress
11 and the Administration is actively encouraging.

12 My central message here today is that the goals of
13 the Children's Television Act should be allowed to work
14 together with broadcasters' natural incentive to reach large
15 audiences with high-quality programming. That can only happen
16 if the FCC's regulatory scheme is implemented in a way that
17 takes into account the economic realities of today's
18 broadcasting business.

19 The first of these economic realities is as follows:
20 Substantial amounts of educational and informational
21 children's programming is already available in the video
22 marketplace as a result of normal economic incentives. It is
23 no accident, for example, that much high-quality children's
24 programming is found on Public Broadcasting Service, the
25 Nickelodeon cable network and on the Disney Channel. None of

1 these outlets relies exclusively on audience-based advertising
2 sales to survive. Their audiences need not be nearly as large
3 as advertiser-supported broadcast audiences to make the
4 programming economically viable.

5 The second economic reality is that audiences no
6 longer come to broadcast stations and networks like they did
7 in the age of Captain Kangaroo. We broadcasters have to go to
8 great lengths to attract viewers by utilizing high-quality
9 entertainment and production values. Unlike cable-based
10 program services, we are a mass medium which must support
11 itself with advertising revenue only. Our success is
12 dependent on our reaching as many people as possible with our
13 programming. If over-the-air broadcasting doesn't act on that
14 incentive, it will wither and die.

15 Given these economic realities, I submit that
16 proposals for stepping up regulatory oversight in the
17 children's area either with weekly programming quotas or a
18 narrow definition of educational and informational programming
19 would be fundamentally wrong.

20 There is a market for quality children's educational
21 programming on commercial broadcast television but that market
22 is constricted by the program choices that are already
23 available from public television, and from cable based
24 distributors who have normal economic incentives to provide
25 such programming. And, it is a market which cannot be

1 enlarged or satisfied by government fiat. The FCC could not
2 regulate the quality of a television program, even if it
3 wanted to. Nor can it require children to watch government
4 favored programs that meet its definition of educational.

5 The flexibility which Congress built into the
6 Children's Television Act makes sense and was intentional.
7 Congress set precise commercial time limits and could have set
8 mandatory programming standards if it so chose, but it did not
9 adopt that course. The flexible approach chosen instead
10 allows broadcasters to budget development money to create
11 attractive entertainment values in their children's
12 programming, and to concentrate resources on providing
13 audience drawing quality rather than lowest common denominator
14 quantity.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. ELLERBEE: Thank you very much. Next we will
17 hear from Dr. Kathryn Montgomery, President of the Center for
18 Media Education.

19 MS. MONTGOMERY: Thank you. I very much appreciate
20 the opportunity to be here today. For the past 2 years the
21 Center for Media Education's campaign for Kids' T.V. has been
22 working closely with a broad coalition of education and child
23 advocacy and parent organizations to see that the Children's
24 Television Act has its intended effect of increasing the
25 amount of children's educational and informational programming

1 on broadcast television.

2 In 1992, we released a report analyzing license
3 renewal applications and found that many stations were simply
4 relabeling cartoons such as The Jetsons and G.I. Joe as
5 educational, hardly what the Act intended.

6 We have just completed a new study that reveals
7 major barriers within the television industry to successful
8 implementation of the Children's Television Act. We
9 interviewed producers and distributors of the program designed
10 to fulfill the mandate of the Act as well as programming and
11 other experts.

12 We found that most of the programs created in
13 response to the law have been assigned a second class status
14 and our investigation revealed clear patterns in the
15 production, scheduling, and promotion of so-called FCC
16 friendly shows. The most disturbing pattern is that these
17 programs are often scheduled in marginal time slots when it is
18 impossible for children to see them. It is common practice
19 for a station to put its compliance show on at 6:00 a.m. or
20 even 5:00 a.m. just so it can tell the FCC it has a show. The
21 pattern was confirmed by an analysis we recently conducted
22 using a 1 week sample of 20 markets. Nearly 40 percent of the
23 so-called FCC friendly syndicated shows were airing at 6:30
24 a.m. or earlier and almost half of those were on at either 5:00
25 or 5:30 a.m.

1 According to the A.C. Nielsen Company, only about 5
2 percent of children are watching T.V. before 7:00 a.m. At
3 5:00 a.m. the figure is a little over 1 percent. As one might
4 expect, pre-dawn scheduling was a death knell for a number of
5 series in our study which are now off the air. The network
6 FCC friendly series often find themselves on at 11 a.m. or
7 noon on Saturdays when the network or the affiliate stations
8 are more likely to preempt them for sports. As a consequence,
9 children are deprived of the opportunity to see the programs
10 which in turn have difficulty building a regular audience.
11 For example, CBS Science Series Beakman's World was preempted
12 14 out of 17 weeks on the west coast over a 4 month period
13 this past winter. The ABC series City Kids created by Hensen
14 Productions, which debuted last fall, was shifted around in
15 the schedule and repeatedly preempted by college football
16 games, finally disappearing all together in February. Most
17 viewers never knew it existed.

18 Our study also revealed some very troubling business
19 practices which are making it almost impossible for
20 educational and informational programming to gain entry and
21 survive. As a consequence of the FCC's deregulation of
22 children's television in 1984, most series in today's market
23 are now part of a highly lucrative merchandising and licensing
24 package with heavy financial and creative participation by
25 major toy companies that manufacture and market licensed

1 characters and other products related to the show.

2 The series are, in effect, advertising vehicles for
3 the licensed products as many of those we interviewed frankly
4 admitted. In the syndication market not only are these
5 programs given free to stations but stations often demand
6 additional payments of a million dollars or more to get a
7 program into the best time slot.

8 These practices put educational and informational
9 programs at a great disadvantage. They also raise disturbing
10 questions about who is really setting the agenda for what
11 America's children will see over the public airways.

12 The children's television marketplace today is not a
13 level playing field for educational and informational
14 entrants. It is because of the powerful marketplace forces
15 which work against such programming that we need effective
16 public policies to counter them.

17 Many of the producers and distributors we
18 interviewed for our study warned us that if the FCC doesn't
19 strengthen the rules, the market for educational and
20 informational programs would likely dry up.

21 The current rules are so weak and have so many
22 loopholes that they have undermined Congress' intent in
23 passing this important law. We're calling for a number of
24 changes, including a clear definition of educational and
25 informational programming, changes the rules so stations don't

1 get credit for programs that air between -- before 7 o'clock,
2 and a processing guideline of an hour a day of core
3 educational or informational programming. And as the
4 Commission well knows, this is not a quota. It is an optional
5 safe harbor that broadcasters may use to document their
6 compliance with the law. This guideline could also correct
7 another pattern we found in our recent analysis of T.V.
8 listings in which two-thirds of the stations in our 20 market
9 survey aired no educational programming for children in
10 weekdays.

11 Even more disturbing when we look for news and
12 current affairs programming for children, we found only two
13 half-hour programs out of a total of more than 10,000 hours of
14 weekday programming. I urge the Commission to act decisively
15 on behalf of children just as deregulation in the early '80s
16 significantly affected the children's marketplace. The
17 Children's Television Act, if given more force and clarity,
18 could alter the current dynamics of what that marketplace will
19 -- and, and help that marketplace benefit children.

20 MS. ELLERBEE: Thank you. Next we'll hear from
21 Sheila Tate, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Corporation
22 for Public Broadcasting.

23 MS. TATE: Thank you and thank you for your
24 invitation to appear before you here today. Like all American
25 parents, I have watched with growing dismay as the issues of

1 crime, drugs and violence have become larger and more
2 intractable, especially as they affect our children. And with
3 every passing day, I have become more certain that television
4 can play a powerful role in reversing the trends. Television
5 reaches virtually every child in every household. it is an
6 extraordinary resource in creating and molding opinion, in
7 educating and informing.

8 Public television has an honorable history in
9 children's education. Parents trust our programming for
10 children to provide learning that comes to life. Programs
11 like Sesame Street, Reading Rainbow and Ghostwriter are
12 recognized for their superior ability to educate while they
13 also entertain.

14 But I need to stress here that producing quality
15 children's programming is not easy, it's not fast, it's not
16 inexpensive. Let me give you some examples.

17 First, it's our experience that a critical mass of
18 programming is needed before a series can go on the air. From
19 a scheduling standpoint, at least 65 episodes are needed and
20 preferably 130. Single programs or miniseries just do not
21 work for children.

22 Second, children's programming requires a large
23 initial investment. For example, Ghostwriter, a show which
24 stresses reading and writing, completed and distributed 42
25 programs in its first season. The total production cost

1 reached \$20 million. Granted, much of the initial funding
2 went to outreach material, to educational supplements, but
3 even a game show like Where In The World Is Carmen Sandiego,
4 without such supplements, cost \$4.7 million in its third
5 season.

6 Third, the high cost of developing new children's
7 programming for public television is based in part on the need
8 to develop positive and substantial educational values. This
9 requires lengthy testing and research. In many cases, that
10 may take as long as 24 months, as it did with the new series,
11 Puzzleworks.

12 Fourth, public television has found it difficult to
13 get funding for children's programming. Corporations are
14 simply not convinced that children's programming on public
15 T.V. reaches their markets. The bottom line here is the
16 exposure of the company name and product. Wonderworks, for
17 example, won all sorts of awards, emmys, international emmys
18 but in eight seasons on the air, it was never able to attract
19 a corporate underwriter.

20 Finally, there's been an unnecessary chasm between
21 commercial kids T.V. and non-commercial. The Children's
22 Television Act of 1990, and the growing concern throughout
23 society about the psychological impact of television on
24 children, is starting, finally, to close that gap. The
25 program, Bill Nye the Science Guy, is a wonderful example of

1 productive cooperation between PBS, the public television
2 station in Seattle, and the Disney Corporation. This new
3 partnership will bring an engaging and humorous science
4 program and all the ancillary services and products to more
5 outlets and more viewers than would have been possible with
6 either commercial or public television alone.

7 Perhaps the most ambitious and important initiative
8 we have is the ready to learn service. The national pilot
9 project will provide seamless blocks of violence free
10 children's educational T.V. every day for pre-schoolers. It
11 will feature some of public television's best known series.
12 Sesame Street, for example, Barney. It will include new
13 programming and community outreach services. That means
14 working directly with parents and with teachers.

15 None of this can be done alone. We welcome new
16 ideas, new talent, strategic alliances. We should not limit
17 our children's minds because of limited means.

18 On the issue of violence, Americans have achieved
19 consensus. Polls show that. Even the young people say 67
20 percent of them say there's too much violence on television.

21 We believe there's been enough posturing and hand
22 wringing on this issue. And we want to find -- we want to, to
23 unleash a powerful new initiative that's, that's bold and
24 focuses not on the problem but on the solutions, solutions
25 already at work across the country.

1 And I would like to enter the rest of my testimony
2 into the record to describe the youth violence initiative that
3 we're undertaking with the help of public broadcasting,
4 commercial broadcasters, and we hope the cable systems as
5 well.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. ELLERBEE: Thank you. Our next panelist --
8 panelists are Dr. Ronald Davis, Director of
9 Telecommunications, Hastings College, and Dr. James Wiest,
10 Director of Hastings College Social Research Center.

11 DR. WIEST: Thank you, Linda. Mr. Chairman,
12 Commissioners, and Mr. Barrett who I'm sure is out there
13 somewhere in T.V. Land.

14 Two fundamental problems block children's television
15 reform. First, no one has given broadcasters a clear
16 definition of educational and informational needs or a way to
17 demonstrate that they have been met. Second, even if
18 broadcasters had the definition, they don't know how to
19 produce good children's programming without losing money.

20 At the Hastings College Social Research Center, we
21 have been working on these two problems for a little more than
22 a year, motivated, I might add, by our conclusion that the FCC
23 was going to do something about children's programming. In
24 that time we developed a research model for defining
25 children's needs at the local level and implemented that

1 design on a limited basis. From our research findings we
2 formulated programming goals and produced and aired four 30
3 minute experimental programs on our local ABC affiliate. The
4 programs attracted advertisers, a significant audience of both
5 children and adults and numerous volunteers to the production
6 process. In addition, we have evidence that children retain
7 factual information from the programming. We think we have
8 established that compelling programming could be produced at
9 relatively low cost while being directed by goals that benefit
10 children. This is a sample of that programming and its goals.

11 The first goal is to stimulate interactivity between
12 the child, family, and community. The second goal is to
13 inspire and guide imagination resourcefulness. The third goal
14 is to provide information that fosters the well-being of
15 children. The fourth goal is provide knowledge of community
16 and heritage, the connections with alternative futures. The
17 fifth goal is to provide a variety of positive role models and
18 information to attain personal potential. And the sixth goal
19 is to foster understanding of mass medias.

20 We think we are on the right track but what we have
21 done is only a beginning. We are here today to ask you to
22 support the concept of more -- of a more comprehensive study,
23 one that would produce children's programming based on
24 research at the regional level. Success at the regional level
25 would provide a model for regions all over the country. Our